
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Landmark/District:	Capitol Hill Historic District	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda
Address:	712 C Street, NE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consent
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concept
Meeting Date:	July 26, 2012	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alteration
Case Number:	12-501	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	Amanda Molson	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition
		<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision

Owner Todd Ragimov, with drawings prepared by Timothy Warren of Visionary Design, Inc., requests concept approval for a rear addition to 712 C Street, NE in the Capitol Hill Historic District.

Property Description

712 C Street, NE is a two-story brick bayfront sited between its mate at 710 and a larger bayfront at 716 (there is no 714 on this row). The existing size of the house is relatively small at 946 square feet, particularly for a lot that is 100' deep. At the rear, the yard opens into a public alley, with the backyard of a condominium building facing 7th Street and the rear elevation of the dialysis center facing 8th Street in close proximity.

Proposal

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story rear addition extending the width of the lot and filling in the open dogleg. The addition would extend 19'-3" from the existing rear wall of the house (which is in the same plane as the rear wall of 710), a projection of a few feet beyond the overall depth of 716. The new addition would add approximately 682 square feet to the size of the house, representing less than half of the existing square footage. The rear elevation of the new addition would be clad in hardiplank, with the side walls parged in stucco.

Evaluation

When first filed, the applicant's plans included demolition of the entire rear ell of the house and its replacement with the new addition. Although the existing rear ell is not particularly distinguished from a design perspective, it is original to house and constitutes a substantial portion of the existing historic fabric. The result posed a conflict with the demolition provision of the historic preservation regulations and with the Board's general principle that an addition should be subordinate and deferential to the historic building.

At the suggestion of HPO and as shown in the drawings submitted to the Board, the applicant now plans to retain the existing rear ell, making intermittent openings as needed to access the new space. Additionally, the addition was reduced in depth by 3' from the original proposal,

resulting in a more sympathetic ratio of old to new. Although the house will become the deepest on the row post-construction, it will not be overwhelming in comparison to the existing house.

Considering the extent of interior demolition planned, it seems likely that the applicant will also propose such alterations as replacement of the existing front windows and door and landscaping/hardscaping in the front yard. Details of these elements, including materials, should be worked out with HPO and properly permitted. Replacement of the existing mismatched windows and non-original front door, repair of the damaged front fence, and replacement of the suffering lead walk would be welcome.

The original plans showed a small setback on the rear of the second floor, providing space for a covered balcony. Although this balcony still appears in the rear elevation drawing, it no longer appears on the floor plan (though a door leading to nothing does still appear). Inclusion of the balcony is not necessary to merit HPO support for the project, but the plans should be corrected before final approval can be granted.

Recommendation

The HPO recommends that the Board approve the concept as consistent with the purposes of the preservation act and delegate final approval to staff, with the condition that the second floor plan and rear elevation drawing are reconciled to show any plans for a balcony.